

REMARKS

In accordance with above amendments, claim 65 has been amended. Thus, claims 51-53, 55-57 and 65-66 remain under consideration in this application. No claim has been allowed.

It is believed that the amendments to claim 65 overcome the rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, raised in the present Office Action. It is believed that the changes to the claims are clearly supported in the specification. For example, see page 6, line 19 through page 7 line 22 and in the drawings Figures 1 and 2 which indicate clearly the low profile of the lift and dump mechanism when lifted. Copies of Figures 1 and 2 are offered as Exhibits A and B, respectively, to this paper showing the extreme height of the lift and dump mechanism as being well within the side opening of the truck body for emptying a refuse container. Note that the container must be emptied through the side opening in the truck body. Thus support for the claim language must be inferred and it is clear that no new matter has been introduced.


The amendments to claim 65 together with earlier explanation of specific differences render the remaining claims patentable with respect to the combination of art cited and items 5 and 6 of the present Action. It is believed that the teachings of these references would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the specific design arrangement claimed.

Particularly, it is noted with regard to the use of a rotary actuator in combination with a one piece curved arm (or arms) handling system that enables the mechanism to accomplish the complete lift and dump cycle of a grasped container based on the operation of a single rotary actuator. This clearly cannot be accomplished, for example, with the design of Sizemore et al. '576 in which the rotary actuator is but a small part of a far different and more complicated mechanical system. None of the mechanisms shown in the references approach the simplified construction of that claimed in the present application. Although Christensen '628 indicates that the mechanized apparatus may be of "any variety", that does nothing to teach the presently claimed device.

The mechanical container handling system of the present invention clearly involves more than any combination suggested by the references as it is a new and much simplified mechanism.

Accordingly, reconsideration, withdrawal of the remaining rejections and allowance of the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.



C. G. Mersereau,
Attorney Reg. No. 26,205
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 339-7461